



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,215	02/17/2000	Shimada Naohiro	P/126-182	7056

7590 03/31/2004

STEVEN I. WEISBURD, ESQ.  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP  
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS - 41st FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER

PRIETO, BEATRIZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2004

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/506,215

Applicant(s)

NAOHIRO, SHIMADA

Examiner

B. Prieto

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 15-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

Art Unit: 2142

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This communication is in response to amendment/request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 of the above identified application filed 2/06/04. Claims 1-2 and 15-16 remain pending and are hereby presented for examination.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this case, the specification and Figs. 4-5 and 2 have been reviewed, however no supporting evidence to added claim limitation "a first layer being the lowest in the layering, a second layer being higher than said first layer and lower than said third layer in said layering" has been found.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action may be found in previous office action.

5. Claims 1-2 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudo U.S. Patent No. 6,256,326 in view of Ellis et. al. (Ellis) in view of 6,256,292 U.S. Patent No. 6,256,292.

Regarding claim 1, Kudo teaches claimed invention substantially as claimed, teaching a node(s) (4 and 6 of Fig. 9, col 6/lines 6-21) comprising layers (Fig. 6) including:

a first layer (layers HPT through PPI of Fig. 6), a second layer (layers MSA of Fig. 6) and a third layer (layers MSP to SPI of Figure 6);

a packet is processed ("mapped") in said first layer (Fig. 6, step b1, col 6/lines 60-col 7/line 3 and col 19/lines 42-50);

Art Unit: 2142

said first layer determines whether the packet is to be transmitted to another identified node via an established data link (col 6/lines 39-45, col 8/lines 17-22, transmission to the next node or adjacent node col 22/lines 17-26) and transmitting data (packet) to said third layer through said second layer when determine that the packet is to be forwarded to another node (Fig. 12, col 8/lines 4-15, 33-42);

although prior art teaches determining whether the packet is to be hopped to a next node, it does not explicitly teach, where it determines is the packet is to be dropped at said node;

Ellis teaches a system method related to transmission apparatuses and method in a communication network, wherein that line terminal equipment (LTE) (e.g. add-drop multiplexer ADM) operate in the physical layer (first layer, path and/or line sublayer) (Fig. 1) configured with means for accessing accesses signals that need to be dropped or inserted at that site, the rest of the traffic continuing straight through (col 7/lines 39-48, Fig. 2B, element 350).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaches of Ellis for judging at the first layer whether the packet is to be dropped to said node or hopped to a next node, one ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to utilize the logical (configurable software modules) layers associated with Sonet model including transmission path, multiplex section and regeneration sections as suggest by Kudo, allowing a straight path through between two consecutive line terminal equipment and taught by Ellis.

Regarding claim 2, the first layer transmits (Kudo: Fig. 12, marked as A, col 8/lines 4-15, 33-42, Ellis: col 7/lines 21-25, 64-65).

Regarding claims 15-16, these claims are the method claims associated with claims 1-2, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

*Response to arguments*

6. Applicant argues layers one through three are *well known in the art*, because these are defined layers of the OSI model. According to applicant, it is readily understood from invention's Figs. 4-5 and 2 that the layers herein illustrated are the layers of the OSI model.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, it is noted that nowhere in the specification is the OSI model mentioned. Figs. 4-5 of the invention illustrated a 1<sup>st</sup> layer above or higher than a 2<sup>nd</sup> layer. No where in the OSI model is a 1<sup>st</sup> layer above or higher than a 2<sup>nd</sup> layer defined, the OSI model does not define a 1<sup>st</sup> layer higher than a 2<sup>nd</sup> layer and 3<sup>rd</sup> layer. Nowhere in the OSI model is a 1<sup>st</sup> layer defined as comprising termination of SOH, LOH and POH as illustrated on Fig. 5. The incorporation of *well-known subject matter* in the claims, does not make the claims patentable. Furthermore, a "Well know admittance statement", in which applicant admits on the record that the subject matter in relation to the amended limitation, i.e. "a first layer being the lowest in the layering, second later being higher than said first layer and lower than said third layer in said layering", is well know in the art, and therefore the techniques for implementation and/or enablement, are readily recognize by one ordinary skill in the art. Is taken as being available as prior art against the claims see MPEP §2129, and 1.131. Therefore, the limitation's elements will be construed as encompassing any and every art-recognized hardware or combination of hardware and software technique for implementing the defined requisite functionalities. Thereby, claim 1 is not distinguishable over the prior art and not patentable. Claim 15 is a method claim corresponding to claim 1 as indicated by applicant, and thereby not patentable for the same reasons.

7. Applicant indicates that amendment to the claim language is explicitly disclosed in the specification, specifically, in the Figures 4-5 and 2, wherein the first layer is the lowest layer in the layering, thereby the terms of the claims must be read in view of the specification.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, it is noted that disclosure has been reviewed, however nowhere in the specification is the OSI model mentioned. Figs. 4-5 of the invention illustrated a 1<sup>st</sup> layer above or higher than a 2<sup>nd</sup> layer. Attention is made to Figure 2, which does not illustrate a first layer or a second for that matter. Nowhere in the OSI model is the layering illustrated in Figs. 4-5 defined, the OSI model does not define a 1<sup>st</sup> layer above or higher than a 2<sup>nd</sup> layer and 3<sup>rd</sup> layer. See supplemental advisory (11/12/03) for definition of the layers as set forth by the invention's specification.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 02/06/04 have been fully considered but not rendered persuasive.

Art Unit: 2142

9. Applicant is reminded that in accordance with 37 CFR 1.530 (e) Status of claims and support for claim changes. Whenever there is an amendment to the claims pursuant to paragraph (d) of this section, there MUST also be supplied, on pages separate from the pages containing the changes, the status (i.e., pending or canceled), as of the date of the amendment, of all patent claims and of all added claims, and an explanation of the support in the disclosure of the patent for the changes to the claims made by the amendment paper (see MPEP 2234).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0750. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Jack B. Harvey can be reached on (703) 305-9705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to the Central Fax Office:

(703) 872-9306, for Official communications and entry;

Or Telephone:

(703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist), further ensuring that a receipt is provided stamped "TC 2100".



B. Prieto  
TC 2100  
Patent Examiner  
March 30, 2004